

SN. 10/601,685

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. KASA:026

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration. Non-elected claims 4-9 and 11-13 remain withdrawn.

Amendment

Independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 8 have been amended to define that the one edge portion of the saw body is angled relative to the major portion of the saw body at a location immediately next to the tooth base line within a tooth base line area. No new matter has been introduced.

Art Rejection

Claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Causey (USP 1,630,468), and claims 1-3 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Causey, essentially because claim 1 did not clearly define the location of the bend.

The examiner contends that any portion spaced from the teeth but within that area could be considered to be a "tooth base side tension zone" or a "major portion."

First, applicant submits that, in contrast to the examiner's understanding, Causey's teeth are not angled relative to the major portion since the entire saw body is curved at a constant radius of 40 feet. See lines 87-92.

Second, independent claims 1, 4, 7, and 8, as presently amended, each define that one edge portion of the saw body is angled relative to a major portion of the saw body at a location immediately next to a tooth base line within a tooth base line area, and that the tooth base line area is located between the tooth base line and the tooth base tension zone. Causey states that the greatest tensioning is applied at approximately the center of the width (point 3), or about 6.25 inches from the bottom of the gullet of the saw tooth. Accordingly, even if one side of saw body is deemed angled, it is not angled immediately adjacent to the tooth base line. Applicant thus submits that the claims clearly define over Causey.

Interview

Applicant seeks an interview should the examiner maintain the same rejection. In this respect, the undersigned will contact the examiner shortly.

SN. 10/601,685

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. KASA:026

Conclusion

Applicant submits that claims 1-13 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KJMMS & McDOWELL LLP

20 MARCH 2006
DATE

LYLE KIMMS
REG. NO. 34,079 (RULE 34, WHERE APPLICABLE)

P.O. Box 826
ASHBURN, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)